

## **REMARKS**

### **I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

The Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration of this application and for the indication of allowable subject matter. The Office Action dated March 16, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully considered. The Applicants have placed allowable claim 3 in independent form as was suggested by Examiner by incorporating claim 3 into independent claim 1. Claim 3 is currently cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 2, and 4-15 are currently pending in this application. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### **II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being definite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Specifically, the Examiner found the terminology “direct or indirectly” to be indefinite. Claim 9 is currently amended to remove the phrase “direct or indirectly” from the claim language. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### **III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A)**

Further on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,428,173 to Knell, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,016,688 to Tiffin et al. On page 3, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knell, in view of Tiffin, and in further view of U.S. Patent 4,337,601 to

Vaerk et al. Again, the Applicants wish to thank Examiner for the allowable subject matter. The Applicants have placed allowable claim 3 in independent form as was suggested by Examiner. In view of the above, all of the prior rejections are rendered moot.

Allowable claim 3 has been placed in independent form by incorporating the substance of allowable claim 3 into independent claim 1. This also corrects an informality of claim 1 to show that the corner regions, not the sidewalls, “include positioning locations for cylinder attachment points” in claim 1. Claim 3 is cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 4-10 and 15 depend from allowable amended claim 1 and are, therefore, similarly allowable.

In view of these amendments Applicants have placed the application in condition for allowance.

### **CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. The Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 22-0261, under Order No. 32016-218521.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 16, 2009

By /Robert Kinberg/  
Robert Kinberg  
Registration No.: 26,924  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
(202) 344-4000  
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

#1036640